DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 063 899 24 HE 003 218

AUTHOR Coleman, Morton; And Others
TITLE Is Conflict Utilization Underestimated?
INSTITUTION Pittsburgh Univ., Pa. University Urban Interface Program.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Bureau of Research.
BUREAU NO BR-8-0725
PUB DATE Oct 71
GRANT OEG-2-9-480725-1027
NOTE 37p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS Conflict; *Conflict Resolution; *Decision Making; *Higher Education; *Management Education; *Problem Solving

ABSTRACT

This document, one of several prepared by the University Urban Interface Program at the University of Pittsburgh, deals with the nature and solution of conflict within the environment. Many professionally trained managers are ill-prepared to deal with conflict in their environment. They often do not see it as a part of their managerial function. It is the contention of this paper that the management of conflict can and should be taught in a formal curriculum aimed at the preparation of managers. The paper is organized into 6 sections. The first section presents a new definition of organizations that incorporates conflict possibilities, thereby changing the manager's expectations about his role. In section 2 current definitions of conflict are examined to see what they offer by way of assistance to the manager in identifying and coping with conflict, and in section 3 areas of conflict are identified. Pittsburgh as a setting for conflict is examined and brief conflict examples are cited in the fourth section. In section 5 a rationale is provided for the University to assume a role in the education of managers in the utilization of conflict, and the final section presents a proposed curriculum model for this type of education (HS)

BR 80725
PA24 BHE

SCOPE OF INTEREST NOTICE
The ERIC Facility has assigned this document for processing to: HE UD
In our judgement, this document is also of interest to the clearinghouses noted to the right. Indexing should reflect their special points of view. SD

ED 063899

UNIVERSITY FORUM

BACKGROUND PAPER

IS CONFLICT UTILIZATION UNDERESTIMATED?

OCTOBER 21, 1971

UNIVERSITY-URBAN INTERFACE PROGRAM

CONTRACT NO. OEG-2-9-480725-1027
PROJECT NO. 80725

SUBMITTED TO THE
BUREAU OF RESEARCH U.S.O.E.

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY
UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH
OCTOBER, 1971

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

HE 003 218

UNIVERSITY-URBAN INTERFACE PROGRAM

UNIVERSITY FORUM

BACKGROUND PAPER

IS CONFLICT UTILIZATION UNDERESTIMATED?

OCTOBER, 1971

by

Morton Coleman

James V. Cunningham

Marvin Feit

Norman Johnson

Philip Carter

Joseph Colangelo

Albert C. Van Dusen, Ph.D.
Secretary of the University
(Vice Chancellor)
Principal Investigator

Robert C. Brictson, Ph.D.
Director of Research Programs

IS CONFLICT UTILIZATION UNDERESTIMATED?

Morton Coleman
Acting Dean
Graduate School of Social Work
University of Pittsburgh

James V. Cunningham
Professor of Community Organization
Graduate School of Social Work
University of Pittsburgh

Marvin Feit
Former Administrator
Allegheny County Model Cities Program

Norman Johnson
Professor of Social Policy
School of Urban and Public Affairs
Carnegie-Mellon University

Philip Carter
Instructor of Urban Affairs
The Graduate School of Public and International Affairs
University of Pittsburgh

Joseph Colangelo
Director of University News and Publications
University of Pittsburgh

October 21, 1971

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION 1

A DEFINITION OF ORGANIZATIONS 2

THE NATURE OF CONFLICT 6

ARENAS OF CONFLICT 9

CONFLICT IN THE PITTSBURGH REGION 12

THE UNIVERSITY AS A TRAINING CENTER . . . 20

CURRICULUM MODEL 23

CONCLUSION 29

INTRODUCTION

No one can doubt that American society is going through a period of great turmoil, a period characterized by confrontation between established groups and those contending with them. According to Toffler, the pace of this change has accelerated so rapidly, that the human person (in the 800th lifetime on earth) is in danger of colliding with his own future in a cultural confrontation so traumatic that it produces "future shock". This turmoil has touched every segment of society and its institutions, but especially those institutions concerned with education, welfare and health.

Many professionally trained managers are ill-prepared to deal with conflict in their environment. They often do not see it as a part of their managerial function. It clearly is, yet there is little in their own professional preparation that teaches them to cope with it. In fact, most see conflict as a hindrance to their function rather than an opportunity to renew, make more relevant, and reinvigorate the organization they manage.

It is the contention of this paper that the management of conflict can and should be taught in a formal curriculum aimed at the preparation of managers. Conflict is pervasive. It is often an asset to be utilized rather than a debit to be avoided.

The paper is organized into six sections:

1. A new definition of organizations is offered. It in-incorporates conflict possibilities, thereby changing the manager's expectations about his role;
2. Current definitions of conflict are examined to see what they offer in the way of assistance to the manager in identifying and coping with conflict. A new definition is presented;

3. Arenas of conflict are identified;
4. Pittsburgh as a setting for conflict is examined and brief conflict examples cited;
5. A rationale is provided for the University to assume a role in the education of managers in the utilization of conflict; and,
6. A proposed curriculum model for this education is elaborated.

A DEFINITION FOR ORGANIZATIONS

Two pervasive and significant conditions are apparent when one looks at American society: (a) the overwhelming presence of organizations, and (b) continuous conflict. This raises the question of whether the two are related. Is there something inherent in organizations that leads to conflict? An answer to this question is imperative.

How we perceive and define the world determines in large measure how we structure and act in the world. If conflict is a part of the definition of organizations, a radical restructuring of current study on the subject is needed. For example, change in organizations might be viewed interactively, as opposed to the current perspective which suggests that change emanates primarily from external sources. An incorporation of conflict in the definition would place equal emphasis on possibilities for change originating internally as a result of conflict as well. Whether conflict is a part of the definition is in part associated with the sociological mentality. Sociologists have done a major portion of the theoretical work in organizations. The sociological imagination

tends to stress and value normal, non-deviant behavior. It is preoccupied with consensus and resultant interaction. These constructs tend to force a view of organizations as stable interaction structures.

Haas suggests that an organization is a relatively permanent, complex, discernible interaction system. Like most definitions, this one neither explicitly supports a conflict framework nor does it automatically promote a stability framework. Critical analysis of the concepts warrants this assertion.

Permanence suggests recurring frequency of behavior over time. System suggests a lacing between parts and the whole. Interaction suggests patterned reciprocity in the sequences of behavior. Complexity is a differential term used to distinguish organizations from groups. Each of these elements portrays an interface where disagreements can and do occur. Examined by its components, then, the definition does not automatically tend toward the stability mold. It is neutral. If neutrality is the case, why does the stability framework have pre-eminence?

It is the contention of this paper that the sociological mentality serves as a blinder that shields because of its focus.* It blurs conflict as an important element in the contemporary organizational environment. Reality (the public schools, Catholic Church, State Prisons and the Democratic Party) suggests otherwise. Hence, a reformulated definition (a counter-offensive, so to speak) is in order. This counter-offensive is underpinned by both theoretical and practical considerations.

Theoretically, Drabek suggests, "in contrast to the imagery

*Classical economic theory largely rests on the assumption that the marketplace tends to equilibrium. Forces of imbalance are met by counter forces tending toward rebalance.

that stress and strain are unusual, atypical or (dysfunctional) organizations should be viewed as social arrangements where stress and strain are always present." Laing's specific focus is incompatibility (strain) in the organizational authority system. He found that incompatibility of authority systems is a sufficient condition for system incompatibility. The interactive process as operationalized by Laing between the distribution of power among position holders and the processes by which performance of organizational task is evaluated and the impact of the feedback is consistent with our more simple notion of allocation and its potential for creating ambiguity, dissensus, inconsistency and overload which is strain or incompatibility.* There are interpersonal factors (office-holders who are unhappy with their jobs, or who can't get along with each other) and environmental factors (office noise levels, temperatures, or space layouts that isolate work units and reduce interaction) that also contribute to strain. Stress normally, thought of as originating outside the organization (a disaster), existswhen demand exceeds organizational capacity. The welfare rights organization might be viewed as an example of stress generated internally. What is stress and strain, this phenomenon always present in an organization, capable of creating organizational instability? It is conflict.

The counter-offensive is supported by Livingston's work. He discovered there is no direct relationship between performance in school or training programs and success in management. He reveals: "Men who attended Harvard's Advanced Management Program after having had approximately 15 years of business experience, but who, for the most part, have had no formal education in management, earn almost a third more on the average than graduates

*The manager must simply recognize that the allocation of task, authority, status, sanction and evaluation have potential for creating a condition of strain. Hence our simple dictum allocation is related to strain.

of Harvard's MBA program. He concludes that men who get to the top in management have developed skills that are not taught in formal management education programs."

What are these skills? Given the analysis thus far, one may be the ability to recognize where stress and strain might occur in an organization to change performance, and to determine whether or how to use it as a force to be crushed or as a force to renew, reinvigorate or make more relevant the organization. In short, through practice, the veteran manager learns how to manage social reality, which consists of conflict and change on the one hand, and order and stability on the other. Meanwhile, the student of management learns in the classroom to conceptualize and define organizations as relatively stable interactional structures. Hence, in the work situation, as a manager, he waits for the problems to evolve which he solves expertly. But the continuously adaptive nature of organizations require that he aggressively move to identify where conflict is likely to occur and determine how it can be utilized in furthering, changing or impeding the agenda of his organization. As a part of the counteroffensive this new definition of an organization is offered:

> An organization is an open relatively permanent, relatively complex, discernible system of incompatible and compatible interaction that operates in a domain.

This definition conceives of an organization in a disequilibrium/equilibrium framework. It encompasses both stable and conflict possibliities. These concepts have been viewed, heretofore, as antithetical. We view them as operating conjuctively within the same social unit. This definition more accurately depicts reality as consisting of both change and order, both of which are problematical and normal. It suggests further, that it is possible to generate

change internally, as opposed to the belief that it comes primarily from outside as competing organizations seek to dominate the same domain or pursue similar goals.

Having included the possibility for conflict in the definition does not entirely solve the dilemma of constructing a program designed to teach managers how to use conflict creatively. There is dissensus among scholars as to the nature of conflict. This conceptual impasse will be outlined next, concluding with our attempt at clarification.

THE NATURE OF CONFLICT

The nature of conflict is befuddled by: (1) contradictory use of the term, (2) ambiguity about whether conflict is a "process" or a "state," and (3) whether conflict is functional or dysfunctional. Clarity is necessary if effectiveness in training managers in conflict utilization is to be enhanced. Simmel regards competition as an aspect of conflict. Boulding suggests the obverse of Simmel. Mack and Snyder regard both conflict and competition as distinct aspects of struggle. Coser adds a psychological dimension to coflict. He defines it as a process which sometimes takes place as a result of certain patterns of relationships between the parties, such as hostile sentiments or attitudes and antagonistic interests.

Dahrendorf's definition includes "contest, competitions, disputes, and tensions as well as manifest clashes between social forces." Or, he adds, "all relations between sets of individuals that involve an incompatible difference of objectives--i.e., in its most general form, a desire on the part of both contestants to obtain what is available to only one, or only part...." This definition, which includes tensions, inherently expands the definition to include

psychological factors as well as overt struggle.

Fink defines social conflict as "any social situtation or process in which two or more social entities are linked by at least one form of antagonistic psychological relation, or at least one form of antagonistic interaction." The Dahrendorf'sand Fink formulation are somewhat more inclusive yet differ in meaning. The terminological problem then is one of contradictory definitions and inclusiveness.

Related to the definition question is the question of "process" or "state." Since not all psychological or state-of-mind conflicts emerge into an overt process or struggle, it would seem that one must either be able to discern these situations or lose a good deal of accuracy. Fink argues that what appears to be a choice between two conceptual systems isn't really that important. The key issue, he states, "is simply whether the term 'conflict' should apply to only part (manifest conflict only) or to all (latent plus manifest conflict) of a unified dynamic process." Fink also notes "One of the consequences of a conflict state may be the initiation of a conflict process, while one of the consequences of a conflict process may be the resolution or elimination of a conflict state."

Closely allied to the preceding question is the issue of whether conflict is functional or dysfunctional; does it contribute to the maintenance of the social structure or does it disrupt it?

Park suggests it is functional. "Conflict tends to bring about an integration and a superordination and subordination of the conflict groups." Cooley suggests that "Conflict of some sort is the life of society, and progress emerges from a struggle in which individual, class, or institution seeks to realize its own idea of good." (Emphasis added)

Parsons espouses the dysfunctional view. He views the consequences of conflict behavior as disruptive to social systems, and he disregards its positive functions. In The Social System, he explicitly labels "strain" and "tension" as dysfunctional. The dysfunctional view undergirds the frustration-aggression hypothesis for explaining violence. The individual is seen as the source of the problem. It is he who is out of touch with the system, which is basically working in harmony, tending toward equilibrium and homeostasis. Any disruption is seen as "deviant" and the disrupter as sick. Schelling sums up the difference. It is, he says, "between those that treat conflict as a pathological state and seek its causes and treatment, and those that take conflict for granted and study the behavior associated with it."

For the practitioner concerned with the management of organizations in an environment of conflict, these problems would seem unimportant. But the truth of the matter is that a theoretical framework gives a perspective. The practitioner who must manage organizations where conflict possibilities are always present needs this perspective. So while the academician and the practitioner are concerned with different questions about conflict, it is clear that each needs the other. The practitioner needs the perspective. Alternatively, the academician needs a test of the perspective and feedback with regards to its empirical utility, as well as an indication of the areas in which the perspective needs to be further studied and researched.

For our colleagues in practice we offer this perspective. Conflict is stress and strain. It is neither unusual, atypical, or dysfunctional. Its potential is to be viewed as ever-present.

In the abstract it is neutral, but valued in an interactional context.

ARENAS OF CONFLICT

The nature of conflict depends upon the intensity of stress and strain, and the level of organizational life at which these occur. Stress and strain, (conflict), are most likely to occur in three focal arenas in an organization: legitimacy, decision-making, and program.

The legitimacy arena deals with conflict that emerges as a result of issues related to survival. This occurs when there are real differences among sizeable numbers of an organization's constituency concerning its value and whether it should remain a separate entity in the social system.

Conflict also ensues around decision-making rules whereby the organization carries out its allocating function (the heart of strain within the organization). Decision-making deals with the fundamental question of how the institution decides who gets what and why. To challenge decision-making rules is to ask for a revision of the power and communication system within an organization. The end result of such challenges can be a change of organizational actors and/or an alteration in the performance structure as related to decision-making.

The third arena relates to program. Concerns here revolve around the actual choices that an organization makes for the expenditure of it's resources. It is possible for the decision-making rules to be questioned without raising a particular question of program, and its possible to question program without questioning the process by which it was arrived at, although clearly the two are

related.

The differential nature of conflict suggested by these arenas and resultant social events mandates that the manager be able to diagnose the conflict, understand the severity of it, recognize its different forms, as well as possess an understanding of the capabilities of the conflicting parties in terms of system disruption in their drive to substitute their agenda. To illustrate, one conflict may appear particularly intense because of the volatility of the group contesting with the organization, while in actuality the gulf of disagreement, or the power of the contesting group, may be relatively small. In another instance, because a non-demonstrative group is involved, conflict might appear minimal when, in fact, powerful forces are at work. Alternatively, conflict may appear to be centering in one arena, while it really has greater implications for the other two arenas. A conflict over program, for example, may really be a challenge to the decision-making structure of the organization.

The reason it is difficult for the manager to develop an informed judgment regarding the intensity and the organizational level of stress and strain is because today's organizations adjust and change so rapidly that structural legitimacy is constantly being revised downward. In addition, legitimacy of organizations in the urban community today is constantly challenged by activist segments of the consumers of its services, as well as by many of the technocrats who work within the organization. The organization manager is the man in the middle, caught between the groups which provide his organization the means to operate and the groups which the organization seeks to serve both of which are questioning the organization's existence, procedures and programs in a continuously adaptive environment.

The conflict is profound. The public school system illustrates the point. There are parallel organization schemes suggesting limited support for public school programs. There are community control schemes suggesting a need to alter decision-making processes. There is outright abandonment of public education suggesting limited legitimacy for its existence. On all three levels (legitimacy, decision-making and program) stress and strain is marked and, in many instances, the constituents are in polarized positions.

In the past, the organization was able to control the conflict through a reliance on "professional" or "technocratic" competence. Constituency conflict was managed through the imposition of what was accepted as greater knowledge of the situation provided by professional credentials. But in many instances today, the managers's credentials not only have lost credibility, but are outright suspect by the constituency. The traditional organization mechanism for managing conflict through "professional" dictate fails to work and, at times, produces negative results.

The urban organizational milieu then is shifting. Organizational legitimacy in the urban environment today is suspect; decision-making processes tend to be regarded as self-serving, and programs are often seen as inadequate or even harmful.

Thus, the manager of an urban-related organization faces an environment in which intense conflict* is pervasive, and he must respond to this generalized conflict within the limits of his organization's functions. It is against this backdrop that we look specifically at Pittsburgh.

CONFLICT AND THE PITTSBURGH REGION: SOME CASE HISTORIES

Conflict is a pervasive aspect of American life. Citizens contest with their votes. Resources are distributed through a market economy. Marriage is contracted through competitive courtship. Sports involve fierce competition, the more violent, the more popular. The rhetoric of our politicians confirms it: all men are equal at the starting line, but must compete for the prizes our society offers. The Pittsburgh region is no exception.

It has a long history of severe conflict, starting with the birth of the city in violent confrontation between Indians, Frenchmen and the English. The Whiskey Rebellion of 1791-95, which took place in this region, was an uprising of western small farmers against businessmen and eastern politicans who controlled the life of the community. It helped pave the way for Jacksonian democracy and the notion that many should play a role in government.

---

*We have identified three manifestations of conflict thus far. We have categorized these manifestations in terms of their source and impact on the interaction system in which they occur. Social disasters (Attica) have immediate impact on the performance structure and emerge as a result of a number of acute conflicts occurring on the chronic conflict axis. Crises (student takeovers) have a smaller seismic impact than do social disasters on the performance structure. They emerge as a result of acute conflict. They are telescoped in time. Turbulences (angry school board meeting over reorganization) are mini disruptions occurring more or less continually as a result of chronic conflict. Any one, by itself, has minimal impact on the performance structure, but knitted together their effect on the performance structure could be major.

In the pre and post-civil war periods, as the stakes of wealth and power grew larger, conflicts intensified, most notably in the field of labor disputes: the Railroad Strike of 1877, the Homestead Strike of 1892, and the Steel Strike of 1919, with much blood shed in all three.

This turmoil was not always viewed as a negative process; rather it was seen as a process leading to the renewal and adaptation of institutions and more equitable distribution of resources. Robert A. Weeds writes accordingly about Pittsburgh:

> Beginning with the British operatives
> and coming down through successives types
> to the present south-eastern Europeans,
> each type up to the present has gradually
> raised its demands, made some headway,
> organized to take still higher ground,
> lost by attack from both front and rear,
> and disappeared up and down the social
> scale throughout the general community.

History often reads failure into conflicts. It views them too as dysfunctional. The truth may be that participation in the large and small conflicts have helped to keep alive the dignity and hope of ordinary citizens, and the drive to continue seeking a larger share in the affluence and power they have helped to create.

Pittsburgh's contemporary history continues to reflect how power and wealth are redistributed through conflict. To a greater or lesser extent, the city has experienced the conflicts that have typified the nation's recent history--between students and administrations, ecologists and corporations, welfare mothers and welfare agencies, blacks and the construction industry. It is clear that how a manager handles conflict indeed determines its outcome. In the examples that follow although structural circumstances were

similar, outcomes were different. The manager we contend made the difference. In fact, Cunningham found after studying 101 Pittsburgh managers that as a manager's assessment of conflict became more positive, sodid the likelihood that he would head an adaptive and innovative organization.

CASH (Turbulence over Program) When pressure built up for government remedial action on housing during the early 1960's a group of people from several neighborhoods, mainly Black, and many from blighted streets, formed Citizens Against Slum Housing. They went door-to-door in eight poverty neighborhoods to hear tenant complaints, and finally forced a long series of city council hearings. In the hearings, citizens described slum living conditions, public officials outlined new programs of code enforcement and construction. Realtors and slumlords were put on the spot.

At the hearings, the city's worst offending slumlords refused to appear and, despite CASH's urging, Council members refused to subpoena the owners and their records. The city solicitor affirmed the legality of subpoenas. The councilmen seemed unwilling to do the investigative work. The mayor did not press them. The situation remained unchanged.

THE HILL DISTRICT (Turbulence over Legitimacy, instead of Program) Up until the early 1960's there were three major traditional group work, recreation-centered social agencies operating in the poverty-filled Hill District of Pittsburgh. These agencies served a limited clientele and were doing little about such crucial problems as unemployment and housing. Many Hill District residents and the city's social welfare establishment were aware that the agencies' programs were inadequate.

A study undertaken by the Health and Welfare Council recommended that the three agencies be dissolved and replaced with a new "community organization" oriented agency. It was proposed that the new agency would catalyze and advocate. The funding source of the three, Community Chest, accepted the Health and Welfare recommendation.

Conflict arose among staff, citizens and board members of the existing agencies as they saw their interest threatened. Debate and pressure mounted internally among the groups. The internal conflict focused attention on problems of staff and board members. The new organization was born. Staff from existing agencies were hired. The Hill is still poverty ridden.

A TRUCKING FIRM (Turbulence over Program) Recently a large trucking and delivering service company in Pittsburgh came under heavy fire (demand) from a Black organization for having only a handful of Blacks among its employees. A new general manager was in charge who had previously gone through a similar situation in another city. He reacted neither by ignoring, dodging, nor denying the issue but rather by joining willingly and openly in a series of negotiations in which he not only short-circuited unfavorable publicity and a boycott of his company, but used the opportunity to test his chief subordinates under potential stress conditions. Through this process he changed some employment practices he wanted changed without the onus falling on him alone.

A UNIVERSITY EXAMPLE (Turbulence over Decision-Making) In the late sixties this school came under attack from students who demanded a revision in the power and communication structure. Groups inside and outside demanded more opportunity for Black people within the

school. The Dean seemed to grasp the need and inevitability of such changes. Demands pinpointed weaknesses and injustices which he recognized although there were disputes over these questions and how to resolve them in the faculty. In an attempt to balance the demand-capacity equation (stress) he made proposals on how these inequities might be rectified. He brought faculty members into the discussions so that they might be more directly informed, as well as provide input in working out the issues, plus gain first-hand knowledge of the pressures coming from multi constituencies served by the school.

Scholarship money for blacks was obtained. Students were given a voice and more Black faculty were recruited and promoted.

THE BOARD OF EDUCATION(From Crisis over Program to Social Disaster over Decision-Making). For more than 50 years, Pittsburgh's Board of Education has been ruled by an elitist, blue-ribbon board whose members are appointed by the county judges, most of whom do not live in the city. Over the years, as the inaccessibility of the board grew, and dissatisfaction with the quality of the schools mounted there developed a general state of conflict between the board and various citizens groups, and the board and teacher organizations.

Finding negotiations fruitless, the citizens began to generate a series of turbulences to achieve their purposes. They demanded to be heard at closed board meetings, picketed, attacked the board in the news media, and even staged a mock trial during which the superintendent of schools was convicted (in absentia) of arrogance and incompetence. Teachers simply went on strike. Stress brought to bear by teachers, parents and citizens was unbearable. The superintendent continued to balk but collective bargaining

contracts came into being. New board members were appointed. Night board hearings were scheduled. A system of elected parent representatives was established. The superintendent resigned.

THE POVERTY PROGRAM (Crisis over Decision-Making) In a Pittsburgh anti-poverty agency a central office director decided to fire a neighborhood director. The latter got wind that the firing was coming and totally cut himself off from communication with his boss. He ignored his supervisor's invitations to come downtown. He refused to take or return phone calls. The central office manager, meanwhile, launched a wide-scale investigation of the neighborhood director's work and found most of it to be quite competent. The reason for firing began to appear feeble by comparison, and it never took place. A side benefit for the central manager was that his aggressive spirit was high for three or four weeks and he was much more effective than usual in his dealings with others, inside and outside his organization.

PORT AUTHORITY (Turbulence into Crisis over Decision-Making) The recent Port Authority Transit (PAT) wildcat strike was triggered by the firing of a driver who wore a "Free Angela Davis" button. PAT is a large organization with continual elements of conflict involving wage negotiations, competition among drivers for routes and shifts, fare increases, subsidies, race tensions among drivers and between drivers and passenger, breakdown of equipment, and proposals for a new rapid transit service. Management of the organization within such an environment would seem to be of crucial importance to the public which depends heavily on PAT for transportation and which underwrites its growing subsidies.

A Black driver wore an Angela Davis button while on duty.

Rider complaints were made to management. The driver was asked to remove the button. He refused. He was fired. A strike ensued which closed one large bus garage for several days and stranded 25,000 commuters. Seemingly, these were side effects all out of proportion to the original rule breaking and the disciplinary action taken. But the unrecognized environmental factors paved the way for turbulence to shift to crisis. Strain already existed between white and Black drivers over promotions, route assignments, and other job prerogatives. If discrimination did not exist, at least it was perceived to exist by the Black drivers. In addition, white drivers over the years had worn various buttons while on duty, including buttons extolling St. Patrick and George Wallace, among others. The Angela Davis button incident triggered an explosion when management seemed to take sides unfairly and act arbitrarily. Arbitration will determine the outcome of a crisis which should have been better handled as turbulence.

What each of these examples indicates as stated when we began this example section, is that behavioral outcomes in large measure are determined by the manager who, by his action, can continue, reduce or dramatically increase conflict possibilities in continuously adaptive interactional structures. Kelly writes that "...if properly handled, conflict can lead to more effective and appropriate adjustments." Unfortunately as the examples indicate this is not always the case.

The anlaysis thus far flies in the face of the human relations conception that suggests that the two major functions of an industrial organization are creating and distributing satisfaction among the members of the organization. The bureaucratic

orientation with emphasis on stability is also challenged. The evidence suggests that the sowing of some tension and dissatisfaction may be helpful to optimize operation.

Elsie Boulding describes an interesting experiment in which a problem was presented to a series of groups created for the purpose of the experiment. Some of the groups contained a "deviant", others did not. In every case, the group containing a deviant came out with a richer analysis of the problem and a more elegant solution. The next step was to request each group to throw out one member. The deviant was thrown out invariably. She concluded that "As long as the group had to work with him, the results were creative; but faced with a choice, the group found it easier to continue minus the person who forced them to confront conflicting views and integrate them." In short, one way for a practitioner to determine consensus around course(s) of action and conflict resolution is by introducing dissensus which should lead to better anlaysis and subsequent better action plans.

The examples point out another general rule with regards to handling conflict. When an organization is attacked from the outside, the burden of the attack should be shared widely with other members of the organization. Involvement generates support, moreover the possibility for many ideas produces possibilities for a wider range of alternative coping strategies. Any backlash from action taken to meet the conflict then does not fall exclusively on the manager. Having viewed Pittsburgh historically as a conflict environment and presenting several contemporary examples leads us now to a rationale for why the university should serve as a center for management learning activities.

THE UNIVERSITY AS A CENTER FOR TRAINING MANAGERS IN CONFLICT UTILIZATION

The foregoing discussion while it may give some structure and initial direction points out clearly the messiness of conflict. The American university has used its resources to deal with messy practical problems since 1824, when Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute was established as the first college of engineering in the United States. We draw the self serving conclusion that it hasn't done poorly. In fact, there has been a constant demand and corollary increase in the use of resources to extend into time, space, and to people* the services of the university to assist in analyzing seemingly unanalyzable problems in all areas of human concern.

Columbia University is the oldest known United States university that designed a curriculum for young men employed in the business and mercantile establishment. Since then, the entire arena of management learning modules has constantly grown. For example, in 1944-45 the University of Wisconsin Management Institute conducted 23 programs for 386 men from 28 companies. Sixteen years later, 1960-61, the Institute had 130 programs for 4,447 men and women from 727 companies. Today the demand is not only for an increase in the availability of management learning modules, but also for improvement in the quality and types of such modules.

The manager who is caught in the throes of organizational tradition, consumer demands and strain between his personal values and demands for efficiency, is in a state of constant organizational conflict. This type of stress and strain, for the sake of the

*Low-income groups in our view are by no means adequate beneficiaries of this extension.

health of his organization, demands that the manager gain insight into what is happening to his organization and the environment around him; comprehend the phenomenon of social change; examine conflict in a positive manner; be exposed to comparative experiences of other managers in similar organizations, and analyze and compare his own skills with the skills necessary for a manager to cope with organizational change.

Universities, in an attempt to deal with the dilemma delineated above, are beginning to reexamine more intensely the phenomenon of conflict and address themselves to the reality of training managers to deal with it. Some universities have initiated studies in the area of Peace, War, and Conflict Research offering varying levels of educational experience and awarding certificates and degrees consistent with that level of experience. The University of Pittsburgh for example is presently initiating a program in conflict research and peace studies for undergraduates.

The term "peace research" is misleading. Isard, states that "Peace Research deals with how to manage conflict situations." Stonier suggests that "the need for peace studies by the late 1970's will be enormous to deal with the outstanding social problem of our time--lethal intergroup conflict."

With this initiative in conflict research already being taken by universities, there is a strong case for beginning to educate managers in conflict utilization in the university. Another asset which the university has is its own experience in coping with, or attempting to cope with, conflict buttressed by its ideological

commitment to examine this conflict since open inquiry is a cornerstone of university education. In addition, courses and conferences on conflict have been constantly increasing at universities throughout the country. Part of this increase might be attributed to healthy growth of the belief that higher education and its faculty members can be realistic, but much of the increase must also be attributed to constantly improving communications between the ivory tower and the market place.

Its proven track record, ideological commitment, squatter's rights and obvious superior research capacity make the university well suited for the task. There are other reasons as well.

Study and Physical Environment: The University is recognized as a place of study. It has built an atmosphere conducive to learning: academic facilities, stocked and equipped bookstores and expansive library services all within easy access.

Neutral Reputation: The image of the university is that of an institution of integrity and objectivity, with the capacity for pure and applied work.

Power of Certification: The university has the legitimate and recognized power of certification, and there is a "door-opening" aspect to diplomas and degrees which is important to practitioners and their clients alike.

A Meeting Place: The urban university, particularly, is a place where scholars and practitioners can come together in a joint learning effort. The Graduate School of Social Work and The Graduate School of Public and International Affairs, both at the University of Pittsburgh have continuously demonstrated this possibility.

The University as a learning center has liabilities. As presently organized, the development of an interdisciplinary strategy rests with the student. He is the integrator. Our approach demands that the burden of integration fall on the organization. As universities are presently organized, it is not likely to happen very quickly. Further, the university lacks respect from men who manage. They see it isolated from real world problems. Additionally, the proposal that we shall offer will call for a realignment of curricula and resources within a university. In most instances realignments are reallocations, conflict that is. Without effective leadership this conflict could entrap any new approach rather than provide the substantive changes about which we speak.

Nevertheless, based on an overall assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of a university engaging in this mission, the authors conclude that the university is an excellent setting for educating managers for conflict utilization.

A CURRICULUM MODEL

The major theses of this paper can be summarized so that they point toward the development of a curriculum for educating managers in the utilization of conflict as well as other management activity.

1) Organizations are social systems, but they are particular social systems. In part, they are systems in which stress and strain are normal. Conflict, therefore, is always present. Understanding it and utilizing it creatively and intelligently are major necessities for the effective manager in the urban milieu.

2) To understand and use conflict, the manager must analyze organizational stress and strain both as to its intensity and the level at which it intervenes in the organization. Three arenas of conflict have been identified by the level at which they arise in the organization: legitimacy, decision-making, and program. Conflict is manifested in social disasters, crisis and/or turbulence.

3) The management knowledge and skill necessary for dealing with conflict, like management skills generally, are not unique to any discipline or profession. There are only two types of management: good or bad. Managers, who in part, have come to know how to advocate, mobilize resources, broker power and mediate disputes as a regular part of their management strategy are probably more likely to be successful managers than those who don't. Currently these skills seem to be developed on the job, but clearly it is necessary that they be approached in the classroom.

4) In most complex organizations there are multiple delivery systems. Persons trained in a particular delivery system (teaching, medicine, social work, public health, etc.) tend to misallocate resources based on their own professional bias. Management, therefore, should be thought of as an inter-disciplinary set of learning activities detached from specific delivery system educational programs.

5) The management process is intricate, and each allocation that the manager makes adds to the process' intricacy, thereby heightening the possibility of strain and stress.

If these five tenents represent reality, then what behavior is desired in managers based on the tenents delineated. The School of Urban and Public Affairs (SUPA) at Carnegie-Mellon University identifies eight behavioral objectives which are very much like those we view as important. The behavioral objectives are:

Systematic and analytical handling of problems: A manager must be able to isolate key factors in a problem from irrelevant details, to perceive new alternatives, and to subject each alternative to logical analysis and critical appraisal in order to provide his own intellectual structure for complex and unstructured problems.

Integrating and understanding fundamental knowledge related to Management: A manager must be exposed to information concerning basic concepts and principles of public administration, social psychology, social welfare, and other administrative skills in a manner that lets him integrate these skills for application to the management process.

Utilizing advanced knowledge in the solution of problems and recognizing where new knowledge is needed: The manager must be bold in seeking our new information or concepts. He must recognize where new data is needed, how to seek it out, manage its development, and integrate it into his own management technique when it becomes available.

Communicating and working with other people: Administrative problems and policy formulations usually are conceived and implemented by individuals working in groups -- often within the context of a bureaucracy. The manager needs to develop skill in understanding human motivations and group relations.

Developing a capacity for growth through continual self-education: The manager dealing with conflict has to be a constant learner. He must develop patterns of behavior through which he constantly seeks new information and adjusts his thinking and practices in the light of what he learns.

Understanding the political, social and economic environment: The manager must understand political reality, social issues, and the functioning of our complex and mixed economic system. This understanding is imperative since political, social, economic and technological considerations frequently are inseparable.

Developing qualities needed for intelligently independent thought and maturity of character: To be successful, the manager must discover how to reach independent conclusions on a carefully reasoned basis so that he can act with integrity in the face of social and organizational pressures and work constructively with others who hold different sets of values.

Making decisions and effectively implementing them: A successful manager must be able to translate his judgements into decisions that can be implemented, or at least attempted, the results of which may be negative or positive to which he in turn must adapt and adjust accordingly.

The underlying assumption of these behavioral objectives turns on the idea that specific institutional knowledge becomes progressively more obsolete as time passes. Organizations change. So do social facts and relations. Any curriculum dealing with the utilization of conflict, therefore, must focus on helping students to acquire background, skills and patterns of operation that enable them to readjust their thinking, perhaps even several times in the course of their careers. To accomplish this basic knowledge, skills and techniques must be learned well. But, most important, a mental and emotional willingness and a capacity to face change and deal with it in a creative and intelligent manner must be developed.

To achieve the behavioral objectives the knowledges, skills and tools from four areas are crucial. The areas are the management and quantitative sciences, the social sciences, economics and the systems related knowledges derived from the engineering disciplines but placed in the context of an interface when machine and human systems meet.

An interdisciplinary setting and the specific content of the four areas should create managers with knowledge, skills and tools that enhance professional practice. The management and quantitative contributions should teach managerial techniques such as planning, budgeting and accounting, as well as provide an understanding of the impact of these processes on organizational and bureaucratic behavior. In addition to these tools, other tools and skills acquired would be probability and statistics, computer programming, deterministic, stochastic and mixed conditional modeling, and public opinion survey techniques.

The contributions of the social sciences would provide basic knowledge concerning the dynamics of institutions and culture. The knowledge base would extend to also include the processes of socialization, group dynamics, social deviation, analysis of community agencies, operation of social and political institutions, the nature of social problems and methods for the resolution of conflict. Cross cultural and historical perspectives would enable views based on some of the origins as well as possible alternatives to present organizational and social arrangements.

Economics teaches an understanding of the use and distribution of resources through an intimate knowledge about the functioning of our economic system and extends to the acquisition of skills in the economic analysis of public decisions. Attention would be given to micro and macro-economics with an emphasis on using the tools of economic analysis as aids for decision-makers who will have to design programs dealing with public problems. Systems synthesis and design provides experiences in dealing with "real" problems by considering important technological considerations first which are treated subsequently as but one part of a broader class of systems. This knowledge provides insight and skill building in problem formulation, the generation of alternative solutions, and evaluation of these solutions within an interdisciplinary framework so crucial when machine and human systems meet.

The course work for developing the competencies in the four areas to meet the behavioral objectives as specified would be as follows:

FOUR-SEMESTER COURSE WORK PLAN*

CONFLICT UTILIZATION

1st Semester	2nd Semester		3rd Semester	4th Semester
Administrative Processes I	II		System Synthesis I	II
Physical-Technical Processes I	II	Summer	Social or Administrative Processes Elective/or Delivery System Elective	Social or Administrative Processes Elective/or Delivery System Elective
Statistics & Probability I	II	Field		
Economics	II	Exp.	Techniques in Optimization	Project Delivery System Elective
Social Processes I	II		Historical-Cross Cultural Analysis	Free Elective
			Delivery System Elective	Delivery System Elective

Our curriculum model is built on the principles of educational manuverability, interdisciplinary approaches and maximum utilization of educational resources. It is undergirded by a conflict framework. Its distinctive features are: (a) the interdisciplinary setting in which the learning occurs, (b) the interdisciplinary theoretical base derived from the social sciences, (c) the two-year conflict utilization sequence, (d) the delivery system elective and (e) the summer field experience.

Specifically, the summer field experience coming between the first and second year gives a student a feel for the pace of professional work; it helps the student field test the knowledge gleaned in the first year, as well as point to areas of needed additional work which can be secured in the second-year electives.

---

*Parts of this program could be easily adapted for short institutes and seminars as a part of the retraining cycle for current practitioners. The Kennedy schools experience would be useful in adapting these retraining cycles.

The delivery system electives utilizes the resources of other parts of the university. They give students an opportunity to gain a foundation in the system they think they want to manage. In a large student population cross fertilization potential is high since not everyone will be interested in the same delivery system. Out of this cross fertilization the students should grasp an initial understanding of inter systems conflict arising out of the different philosophical and historical contexts which created the delivery system in the first place. In short he develops a framework for understanding some parts of conflict. Conflict utilization through real, simulated and casebook experiences enables the student to deal with conflict (stress and strain) that occurrs in various arenas (legitimacy, decision-making and programs) and manifest itself as social disaster, crisis, turbulence and yet to be defined conflict typings. Its two-year perspectives means that conflict is given continuous emphasis throughout the curriculum.

The social process sequence is the key theoretical link providing an academic knowledge base that can be brought to bear in situations of interaction which prevail, and continuously so, for any manager. This key content area drawing from many disciplines makes it essential that a management program is established as an entity separate from university programs dealing with specific delivery systems. Part of the strategy is to guarantee the interdisciplinary nature of the program where the organization is required to be interdisciplinary as well as the student. It is our contention that people from the disciplines are more likely to work together and provide what is desired where no other choices are available than they are when such choices are available. Hence the strategy of an interdisciplinary environment generally and a similar environment in the social sciences specifically.

The material in such an interdisciplinary social science effort would encompass the following: an understanding of values and value conflict within organizations; choice models (individual and collective) within the

organization, and various decision-making mechanisms, as well as an analysis or organizational power and communications models and how they work as expressed in adaptation, diffusion and exchange models; and the political nature of a technocracy and the consumer system. It would also include an analysis of the forces at work in an urban society and their impact on the activities of organizations on the local, regional, state, national and international level. Strategies for conflict utilization would be examined to include education and persuasion, contest by both legal and extra-legal means, confrontation and violence.

This theoretic power should develop the analytic skill to delineate positive, negative and neutral forces working on the organization and enable the manager to make an estimate of their actual or potential influence. Included in this would be the competence to analyze mobilization of conflicting groups, the structure of coalitions, and styles of conflict development as well as capacities that enable him to mobilize resources, advocate positions, broker power, mediate disputes and arbitrate.

CONCLUSION

Organizations have been defined in a way which incorporates conflict possibilities. Since conflict is an inherent part of organizations, it is argued here that it can be used to bring about creative, as well as destructive, changes. By defining conflict as stress and strain, we have been able to begin to outline both arenas and types of conflict. The organizational ubiquity in our national and local life, and the presence of conflict possibilities point out the need to be able to study dispassionately and passionately sometimes these phenomena. A curriculum model, adaptive for short institute work, has been proposed. The implication of the model

is that management programs should be taken away from all those schools and departments within the university that currently teach in the area. This function should be transferred to a new interdisciplinary unit whose speciality would be management undergirded by a conflict orientation. In this context the crucial question for the manager would always be how to utilize conflict effectively to maintain, renew, make more relevant, or reinvigorate the organization in which he manages.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Boulding, Kenneth. Conflict and Defense: A General Theory. New York: Harper, 1962.

2. Coleman, James S. Community Conflict. Glencoe, Illinois: Free Press, 1957.

3. Cooley, Charles H. Social Organization. New York: C. Schribner's Sons, 1909.

4. Coser, Lewis A. Continuities in the Study of Conflict. New York: Free Press, 1967.

5. _____. The Functions of Social Conflict. Glencoe, Illinois: Free Press, 1967.

6. Cunningham, James V. "Entrepreneurship and the Urban Public Executive." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Pittsburgh, 1971.

7. Dahrendorf, Ralf. Class and Class Conflict in Industrial Society. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1959.

8. Davies, James C. "Toward a Theory of Revolution," American Sociological Review. 27, 1962, pp. 5-19.

9. Drabek, Thomas E. "Organizational Stress: A Position Statement." Prepared for the Symposium on Organizational Stress, Denver, Colorado, January 29-30, 1968. A revision and extension of this earlier paper has been entitled, "A Theoretical Framework for the Analysis of Organizational Stress," presented at the American Sociological Association Meeting, Denver, Colorado, August 30, 1971.

10. Feit, Marvin D. "An Innovative Approach to the Study of Violence and Social Change." Unpublished paper presented at the American Society of Criminology Conference, 1970.

11. Fink, Clinton F. "Some Conceptual Difficulties in the Theory of Social Conflict," Journal of Conflict Resolution, 12, 4, (December, 1968), 413-460.

12. Freud, Sigmund. Civilization and Its Discontent. Translated by Joan Riviere. New York: J. Cape & H. Smith, 1930.

13. Haas, J. Eugene. "Race Acceptance and Group Consensus: A Study of Disharmony in Hospital Work Group." Ohio Studies in Personnel Research. Monograph #117, Ohio State University, 25-28.

14. Isard, Dr. Walter (University of Pennsylvania) and Dr. Tom T. Stoufer (Manhattan College), quoted by Mario Milletti in Universities offering Peace Ph.d.'s. Philadelphia Bulletin, July 3, 1971.

15. Johnson, Norman J. "Some Comments on a Theoretical Framework for the Analysis of Organizational Stress." Paper presented at the American Sociological Association Meeting, Denver, Colorado, August 30, 1971.

16. Kahn, Robert L. and Elise Boulding eds. Power and Conflict in Organizations. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1964.

17. Kelly, Joe, "Make Conflict Work for You", Howard Business Review, July-August, 1970.

18. Laign, James D. "Organizational Evaluation and Authority: Overview of a Test of Theory." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Political Science, Stanford University, June, 1967.

19. Livingston, J. Sterling. "Myth of the Well-Educated Manager," Harvard Business Review. January-February, 1971.

20. Mack, Raymond W. and Richard C. Snyder. "The Analysis of Social Conflict--Toward an Overview and Synthesis." Journal of Conflict Resolution. 1, 2, (June, 1957), 212-248.

21. Marx, Karl and Frederick Engels. The Communist Manifesto. New York: Washington Square Press, 1964.

22. McMatton, Ernest F. "Universities and Their Extensions," in Training and Development Handbook. Edited by Robert L. Craig and Lester R. Bittel. New York: Mc-Graw Hill, Inc., 1967.

23. Park, Robert E. New Outline of the Principles of Sociology. Edited by Alfred McClung Lee. New York: Barnes & Noble, 1946.

24. Parsons, Talcott. The Social System. New York: The Free Press, 1951.

25. Schelling, Thomas C. The Strategy of Conflict. New York: Oxford University Press, 1963.

26. Scott, W. Richard, Sanford M. Dornbusch, Bruce C. Busching and James D. Laing. "Organizational Evaluation and Authority." Administrative Science Quarterly, 12, 1, (June, 1967), 93-117.

27. Simmel, Georg. Conflict and the Web of Group Affiliations. Translated by Kurt W. Wolf and Reinhard Bendix. Glencoe, Illinois: Free Press, 1958.

28. Simon, Herbert A. "On the Concept of Organizational Goals." Administrative Science Quarterly. June, 1964.